



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/816,445

03/31/2004

Frank Oliver Hoffmann

34874-096 UTIL

9237

64280 7590 10/31/2007

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

MCLEOD, MARSHALL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,445

Applicant(s)

HOFFMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Marshall McLeod

Art Unit

4152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Traversat et al. (Pub. No US 20020184357 A1), hereinafter Traversat.
4. With respect to claim 9, Traversat discloses a message to include addressing information, wherein the addressing information is defined in accordance with a protocol and the protocol defines addressing information to include party information for the sending application and the receiving application ([147], lines 6-7; Figure 5), and the party information to include identification of a party that is a business party or an agency that is defined by a scheme ([148], lines 6-11); sending the message, from the sending application, according to the protocol ([150], lines 2-3); and receiving, at the receiving application, the message ([150], lines 2-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 4152

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al.

(Pub. No US 20020184357 A1), hereinafter Traversat, as applied to claim 9 above in view of Szabo, (Pub. No. US 20020138618 A1).

7. With respect to claim 1, Traversat discloses a message to include a structured message header, wherein the structured message header is defined in accordance with a protocol, the structured message header comprises information related to at least one component from a set of components defined by the protocol, and the protocol defines the structured header to comprise information related to security for components of the message, ([0435], lines 1-9; [0437], lines 1-7). However, Traversat does not disclose a processing mode for the message. On the other hand, Szabo discloses a processing mode for the message, ([0120], lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Traversat with the teachings of Szabo, because all messages have to be processed once they are received and have to instruct the recipient on how to process it.

8. Claim 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. (Pub. No US 20020184357 A1), hereinafter Traversat, as applied to claim 9 above in view of Szabo, (Pub. No. US 20020138618 A1) and further in view of Ringseth, Paul F. et al. (Pub. No. US 20030014733 A1), hereinafter Ringseth.

Art Unit: 4152

9. With respect to claim 2, the combination of Traversat and Szabo does not disclose a fault message component representing an error occurring at a messaging peer that generated the error. However, Ringseth discloses a fault message component representing an error occurring at a messaging peer that generated the error, ([0068], lines 1-8; [0069], lines 1-5; [0070], lines 1-3; [0074], lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Traversat and Szabo with the teachings of Ringseth, because adding a fault message component would help to speed up messages and prevent message failure.

10. With respect to claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. Furthermore, Ringseth discloses a fault message that is defined to represent at least one error from a set of errors, 9[0071], lines 1-2).

11. With respect to claim 4, Traversat as modified discloses the security for components of the message defined to comprise: information related to a signature of the message; and information related to a signature of a payload of the message, if the message includes the payload, ([443], lines 6-8).

12. With respect to claim 5, Traversat does not disclose a message to include version information, wherein the version information indicates a protocol used to define the message. However, Szabo discloses a message to include version information, wherein the version information indicates a protocol used to define the message, ([104], lines 1-8). It would have

Art Unit: 4152

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Traversat with the teachings of Szabo, to have a message include version information. It would be obvious because defining a message will tell the receiver how to handle a received message and speed up message processing.

13. With respect to claim 6, Szabo discloses the version information includes a major version and a minor version, ([0094], lines 1-2; Figure 12).

14. With respect to claim 7, the combination of Traversat and Szabo does not disclose wherein the messaging component is operative to process the message if the major version is less than or equal to a major version for which the messaging component is configured. However, Ringseth discloses wherein the messaging component is operative to process the message if the major version is less than or equal to a major version for which the messaging component is configured, ([0055], lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Traversat and Szabo with the teachings of Ringseth. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art that processing a message if the major version is less than or equal to a major version will tell the receiver how to handle a received message and speed up message processing.

15. With respect to claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above. Ringseth discloses wherein the messaging component is operative to process the message if the

Art Unit: 4152

major version is less than or equal to a major version for which the messaging component is configured, (Ringseth [0055], lines 1-7).

16. With respect to claim 10, Traversat as modified discloses a message according to a class of messages, wherein the class of messages is one of a plurality of classes of messages that are defined by a protocol, ([0087], lines 1-4; [0378], lines 1-3).

17. With respect to claim 11, Traversat as modified discloses receiving a message, from the sending application, at a first component of the collaborative network; in response to the first component successfully receiving the message, the first component sending a transport level acknowledgement to the sending application; the first component modifying the message to include the first component on a hop- list in the message; the first component causing the message to be sent to the receiving application; in response to receiving an acknowledgement message, from a second component, indicating that the message has been received by the receiving application, the first component sending a transport level acknowledgement to the second component, ([0384], lines 1-6). Szabo also discloses the same ([0169], lines 1-6; [0170], lines 1-4).

18. With respect to claim 12, Traversat as modified discloses the first component sending the message to one of one or more components in the collaborative network, wherein each component is operative to: send a transport level acknowledgement, in response to successfully receiving the message; cause the message to be sent to the receiving application; include the component on the

Art Unit: 4152

hop-list in the message, by modifying the message; if the component sends the message to the receiving application, generate the acknowledgement message, and send the acknowledgement message; and send a transport level acknowledgement in response to successfully receiving the acknowledgement message ([0384], lines 1-6; [0386], lines 1-6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marshall McLeod whose telephone number is (571) 270-3808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 a.m-5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on (571) 272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MM 10/1/2007

Application/Control Number: 10/816,445

Page 8

Art Unit: 4152

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pierre Vital", is positioned above the printed name.

PIERRE VITAL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100